

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, and 21-24 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected all claims. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, and 7. In this response, the Applicant has cancelled claims 2 and 22. In view of these changes the Applicant hereby submits a total of 6 claims for the Examiner's consideration.

Specification and Oath

The Examiner has objected to the Specification and Oath and has requested that Applicant amend the specification and provide a supplemental oath to reflect complete continuation data for the instant application.

The Applicant has amended the Specification as requested by the Examiner.

With all due respect to the Examiner, the Applicant contends that the need for a supplemental oath is not necessary in view of an appropriate Oath and Declaration being filed for patent application 09/804,686, which the Applicant claims the benefit of for purposes of this continuation application. As the Examiner shall appreciate an Oath and Declaration is not required for a continuation application, if the earlier patent application has a properly filed oath and declaration. Applicant's file reveals that the requested oath and declaration for patent application 09/804,686 was filed on September 4, 2001. If the Examiner's records are incomplete, a duplicate copy may be provided.

102(b) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7 and 21 and as being anticipated by Omae et al. (4,163,886). With respect to claim 21, the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection because in claim 21 the Applicant includes a limitation of a
5 CPU in the operator control panel. In Omae '886, the control panel is a keyboard tied to a computer via a first bus, and the computer then communicates with a command generation circuit via a second bus.

However, to expedite the prosecution of this patent application the Applicant has amended the independent claims 1 and 21 to include *inter alia* the limitations
10 from claim 2 and 22, respectively. Subsequently, the Applicant cancelled claims 2 and 22. The affect of additional limitations that have been added to the independent claims are described in further detail below.

103(a) Rejection

15 The Examiner rejected claim 2 and 22-24 as being unpatentable over Omae '866 taken with Marhofer et al. (5,932,123). The Examiner states that it would have obvious to provide the system of Omae '886 with the feedback claimed, the motivation being the teachings of Marhofer '123 that such is advantageous in a computer controlled welding system.

20 The Applicant disagrees because as previously claimed the Applicant describes three elements: an operator control panel and a power supply module

configured to communicate with a welding power supply. The operator control panel communicates a welding voltage to a power supply module via a common bus. The power supply module then communicates the welding voltage to the power supply. Feedback from the power supply is then communicated to the power supply module.

In FIG. 2 of Marhofer '123, a monitor 50 simply permits an operator to monitor and display welding data that includes welding voltage. In the Applicant's claims 2 and 22, the welding voltage is communicated from the operator control panel to a power supply module, which then communicates the welding voltage to a *welding* power supply. Feedback from the welding power supply is then communicated to the power supply module.

Neither Marhofer '123 or Omea '886 teach communicating welding voltage via a common bus to the power supply module, which is configured to communicate this welding voltage to a welding power supply.

Additionally, the claims have been amended to have the common bus communicate with a *plurality* of modules. The dependent claims 3 and 7 identify one of these modules being either a wire feed module or an oscillator module. The dependent claims 23 and 24 also identify these modules being a wire feed module and an oscillator module. Neither Marhofer '123 or Omea '886 teach a *plurality* of modules communicating with the operator control module via a common shared bus.



Conclusion.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully submitted.

5

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "MaK", written over a horizontal line.

Michael A. Kerr
Reg. No. 42,722

10

15

Dated: April 14, 2006

20

VIRTUAL LEGAL, P.C.
3476 Executive Pointe Way, Ste. 16
Carson City, NV 89706
Telephone: (775) 841-3388
Facsimile: (775) 841-3389